APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/773,497	02/06/2004	David K. McKnight	CA919990017US2	6632

			EXAMINER
25259 7590 07/03/2006			PATEL, MANGLESH M

IBM CORPORATION
3039 CORNWALLIS RD.
DEPT. T81 / B503, PO BOX 12195
REASEARCH TRIANGLE PARK, NC 27709

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

DATE MAILED: 07/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/773,497	MCKNIGHT ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Manglesh M. Patel	2178	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>06 February 2004</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>14,15,37-39 and 44</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>14,15,37-39 and 44</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>06 February 2004</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. <u>09489793</u>.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This **Non-Final** action is responsive to the application filed on 02/06/04.

2.   Claims 1-13, 16-36 and 40-43 are canceled from the previous restriction requirement in

application 09/489793, Claims 14-15, 37-39 and 44 are pending. Claims 14, 37, 39 and 15 are

independent claims.

Priority

3.   Applicant's claim for foreign priority has already been acknowledged in application

09/489793 to which certified copy has been filed in Application 2,285,877 on 10/15/1999

Canada.

Drawings

4.   The Drawings filed on 02/06/04 have been approved.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

5.   35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or
> any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and
> requirements of this title.

Regarding claim 37 & 38 describes a computer program product but fails to include a

computer readable medium for reading the program; the claims are non-statutory because the

product cannot produce a useful, concrete and tangible result without being read by a computer

readable medium.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7.   Claims 14-15, 37-39 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Yasin (U.S. Pub 2004/0205549, filed on Jun 28, 2001).

Regarding Independent claim 14, 37 and 39, Yasin discloses a method for generating an

output document in a user preferred style, comprising the steps of: reading an example file

representing said user preferred style into an input buffer (abstract, paragraphs 13-14, wherein

reading the example file representing the user style into an input buffer includes the grammar

rules style-sheet); searching said input buffer for a pattern that matches that of an expected

section (paragraphs 13-14, wherein the transformation engine searches the buffer for pattern

matches defined in the grammar rules); if said pattern is found, from the position of said pattern,

defining a first bound by searching backwards in said buffer until a previous expected search

pattern is found (paragraphs 23-28, wherein the transformation engine includes comparing a

document to the grammar rules before producing the output document which includes a previous

search of the buffer); from the position of said pattern, defining a second bound by searching

forwards in said buffer until a next expected search pattern is found (paragraphs 23-28, wherein

the next search pattern is the next document section identified by the XSLT engine for

transformation into the output document by comparing the sections to a grammar rule set);

copying a string of characters contained within said input buffer between said first bound and

said second bound to a template buffer (paragraphs 23-28, wherein the characters of the

document section are copied into a template prior to producing an output document by the XSLT

engine); parsing said template buffer to isolate expected keywords, and names and subsections

(paragraphs 36-40, wherein according to the defined grammar rules the template is parsed to

isolate expected keywords and names within a subsection); replacing content-specific

subsections with macro names (paragraphs 32-38, wherein content-specific subsections are

replaced according to the grammar rules applied to the document); and if said pattern is not

found, creating a default template buffer for said expected section (paragraphs 34-39, wherein

Doc1 includes a default template with grammar rules).Yasin fails to explicitly teach the saving of

line offsets and other elements when section in the document are repeated. However it would

have been obvious to save other elements in a repeated document section. The motivation for

doing so would have been to improve future transformation of the output document using the

same grammar rules, thereby improving the processing time of the XSLT engine.

Regarding Dependent claims 15, 38 and 44, Yasin discloses getting a said template buffer for

each section to be generated in said output document (paragraphs 41-46); getting user content for

all sections of said output document (paragraphs 38-41); creating an output buffer for storing

said output document (paragraphs 25-30); for each section of said output document, putting a

corresponding template buffer into a temporary output buffer (paragraphs 23-30); replacing

macro names in said temporary output buffer with user content information: if this section is

expected to be repeated and the user desires alignment, using corresponding template offsets to

modify said temporary output buffer for aligning keywords, names, and other sub-sections

(paragraphs 23-30); inserting the content of said temporary output buffer into said output buffer

(abstract, paragraphs 13-23); and writing said output buffer to a file (abstract, wherein the output

buffer written to a file is the resultant transformed document). Yasin fails to explicitly teach the

saving of line offsets and other elements when section in the document is repeated. However it

would have been obvious to save other elements in a repeated document section. The motivation

for doing so would have been to improve future transformation of the output document using the

same grammar rules, thereby improving the processing time of the XSLT engine.

It is noted that any citation [[s]] to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. [[See, MPEP 2123]]

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Manglesh M. Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-5937.

The examiner can normally be reached on M, W 6 am-3 pm T, TH 6 am-2pm, Fr 9am-6pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Stephen S. Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Manglesh M. Patel
Patent Examiner
June 26, 2006

CESAR PAULA
PRIMARY EXAMINER